

THE TOWER OF LONDON.

From a work entitled "Her Majesty's Tower," by W. Hepworth Dixon, we take the following extracts:—

ASPECT OF THE TOWER.

"Half-a-mile below London Bridge, on ground which was once a bluff, commanding the Thames from St. Saviour's creek to St. Olave's wharf, stands the Tower; a mass of craggy walls and gates, the most ancient and most poetic pile in Europe. Seen from the hill opposite, the Tower appears to be white with age and wrinkled by remorse. The home of our stoutest kings, the grave of our noblest knights, the scene of our greatest revels, the field of our darkest crimes, that edifice speaks at once to the eye and to the soul. Grey keep, green tree, black gate, and frowning battlements stand out, apart from all objects far and near them, menacing, picturesque, ennobling, working on the senses like a spell; and calling us away from our daily mood into a world of romance, like that which we find painted in light and shadow on Shakespeare's page. Looking at the Tower as either a prison, a palace, or a court, picture, poetry and drama crowd upon the mind; and if the fancy dwells most frequently on the state prison, this is because the soul is more readily kindled by a human interest than fired by an archaic and official fact. For one man who would care to see the room in which a council met for a court was held, a hundred like him would prefer to see the chamber in which Lady Jane Grey was lodged, the cell in which Sir Walter Raleigh wrote, the tower from which Sir John Oldcastle escaped. Who would not like to stand for a moment by those steps on which Anselm knelt; pause by that slit in the wall through which Arthur de la Pole gazed; and linger, if he could, in that room in which Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley searched the New Testament together?"

AGE OF THE TOWER.

"Even as to length of days, the Tower has no rival among palaces and prisons; its origin, like that of the Llad, that of the Sphinx, that of the Newton Stone, being lost in the nebulous ages, long before our definite history took shape. Old writers date it from the days of Cæsar; a legend taken up by Shakespeare and the poets, in favor of which the name of Cæsar's tower remains in popular use to this day. A Roman wall can even yet be traced near some parts of the ditch. The Tower is mentioned in the "Saxon Chronicle," in a way not incompatible with the fact of a Saxon stronghold having stood upon this spot. The buildings as we have them now in block and plan were commenced by William the Conqueror; and the series of apartments, the kitchen tower, hall, gallery, council chamber, chapel—were built in the early Norman reigns, and used as a royal residence by all our Norman kings. What can Enropæ show to compare against such a tale? Set against the Tower of London—with its eight hundred years of historic life, its nineteen hundred years of traditional fame—all other palaces and prisons appear like things of an hour. The oldest bit of palace in Europe, that of the west front of the Burgundy Palace, is of the time of Henry the Third. The Kremlin in Moscow, the Doge's Palazzo in Venice, are of the fourteenth century. The seraglio in Stamboul was built by Mohammed the Second. The oldest part of the Vatican was commenced by Borgia, whose name it bears. The old Louvre was commenced in the reign of Henry the Eighth; the Tuileries in that of Elizabeth. In the time of our Civil War Versailles was yet a swamp. Sans Souci and the Escurial belong to the eighteenth century. The Serail of Jerusalem is a Turkish edifice. The palace of Athens, of Cairo, of Teheran, are all of modern date. Neither can the prisons which remain in fact as well as in history and drama—with the one exception of St. Angelo in Rome—compare against the Tower. The Bastille is gone; the Bargehouse has become a museum; the Piombini are removed from the Doge's roof. Vincennes, Spandau, Spielberg, Magdeburg, are all modern in comparison with a jail from which Ralph Flambard escaped so long ago as the year 1100, the date of the First Crusade."

BUILDERS OF THE TOWER.

"Two great architects designed the main parts of the Tower—Gundulf the Weeper and Henry the Builder; one a poor Norman monk, the other a great English king. Gundulf, a Benedictine friar, had, for that age, seen a great deal of the world; for he had not only lived in Rouen and Caen, but had travelled in the East. Familiar with the glories of Saracenic art, no less than with the Norman simplicities of Bec, St. Omer, and St. Etienne, pupil of Lanfranc, a friend of Anselm; he had been employed in the monastery of Bec to marshal, with the eye of an artist, all the pictorial ceremonies of his church. But he was widely known in that convent as a weeper. A monk at Bec could cry so often and so much as Gundulf. He could weep with those who wept; he could weep with those who sported; for his tears welled forth from what seemed to be an unfeeling source. As the price of his exile from Bec, Gundulf received the cross of Rochester, in which city he rebuilt the cathedral, and perhaps designed the castle, since the great keep on the midway has a sister's likeness to the great keep on the Thames. His works in London were—the White tower, the first St. Peter's church, and the old barican, afterwards known as the Hall tower, and now used as the Jewel house. Henry the Third, a prince of epical fancies, as Corlie, Conway, Beaumaris, and many other fine poems in stone attest, not only spent much of his time in the Tower, but much of his money in adding to its beauty and strength. He made Lanfranc his master mason; but Henry was his own chief clerk of the works. The Water gate, the embanked wharf, the Cradle tower, the Lantern, which he made his bedroom, and private closet, the Galleymen tower, and the first wall, appear to have been his gifts. But the prince who did so much for Westminster Abbey, not content with giving stone and piles to the home in which he dwelt, enriched the chambers with frescoes and sculpture, the chapels with carving and glass; making St. John's chapel in the White tower splendid with stained glass. St. Peter's church on the Tower Green, which was built by him, in the Hall tower, from which a passage led through the Great hall into the King's bedroom in the Lantern, he built a tiny chapel for his private use—a chapel which served for the devotion of his successors until Henry the Sixth was stabbed to death before the cross. Sparring neither skill nor gold to make a great fortress worthy of his art, he sent to architect for marble, and to Caen for stone. The dark, heavy, the spawls of brick, the layers of brick, which the walls and towers in too many places, are either earlier or later times. The marble shafts, the noble grills, the delicate traceries, are Henry's work. Traitor's gate, one of the noblest arches in the world, was built by him; in short, nearly all that is purest in art is accessible to his reign."

MAUD THE FAIR.

"In the reign of King John, the White Tower received one of the first and fairest of a long line of female victims, in that Maud Fitzwalter, who was known to the singers of her time as Maud the Fair. The father of this beautiful girl was Robert Lord Fitzwalter, of Castle Baynard on the Thames, one of John's greatest barons; yet the King during a fit of violence with his Queen, Isabella of Angoulême, fell madly into love with this young girl. As neither the lady herself nor her powerful sire would listen to this disgraceful suit, the King is said to have seized her at Danmow by force, and brought her to the Tower. Fitzwalter raised an outcry on which the King sent troops into Castle Baynard and his other houses; and when the baron protested against these wrongs his master banished him from the realm. Fitzwalter fled to France, with his wife and his other children, leaving his daughter Maud in the Tower, where she suffered a daily insult in the King's unlawful suit. On her proud and scornful answer to his passion being heard, John carried her up to the roof and looked her in the round turret, standing on the north-east angle of the keep. Maud's eye was the highest, blindest dot in the Tower; but neither cold, nor timidity, nor hunger could break her strength. In the rage of his disappointed love the King sent one of his minions to her room with a poisoned egg, of which the brave girl ate, and died."

GOD LORD COHMAN.

"Oldcastle died a Martyr." So runs the epilogue to Shakespeare's second part of King Henry the Fourth. "Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man!" In the first draft of Shakespeare's play the mighty piece of flesh, now known to all men as "Sir John Falstaff," was presented to a Blackfriars' audience under

the name of Sir John Oldcastle. Why was such a name adopted for our great buffoon? Why, after having been adopted, was it changed? Why, above all, is Oldcastle first presented by the poet as a buffoon, and afterwards proclaimed a martyr? These questions hang on a story which unfolds itself in the Beauchamp tower. Sir John Oldcastle lived with his young friend, Harry of Monmouth, was a roguish lad, at Gouling Castle, close by Gad's Hill, on the great Kent road. Besides being a good soldier, a sage councillor, and a courteous gentleman, Oldcastle was a pupil of Wycliffe, a receiver of the new light, a protector of poor Lollards, a contemner of monks and friars, a man who read the Bible on his knees, and took the word which he found there to be good for his soul. He was not only a friend of the reigning King, but of the graceless prince. He had fought with equal credit in the French wars and in the Welsh wars; but his fame was not confined to the court and camp. Rumor linked his name with some of the pranks of madcap Hall. We know that he lived near Rochester, and founded in that city a house for the maintenance of three poor clerks. We know nothing about him that suggests the pranks of Gad's Hill and the orgies in Eastcheap. A high, swift sort of man; full of fight, keen of tongue, kind to the poor, impatient with the proud; such was the brave young knight who wedded Joan, last heiress of the grand old line of Cobham, in whose right he held Gouling Castle; sitting in the House of Peers as Lord Cobham, a name by which he was not less widely known and dearly loved than the name of the poor and pious monk everywhere called him the "Good Lord Cobham."

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

FIRST ESCAPE FROM THE TOWER.

"The first offender ever lodged within its walls contrived to escape from his guards, to let himself down from a window, and to slip through the postern to his boat. This bold offender was Ralph of Durham, called the Firebrand and the Lion, who for many years had been treasurer and counsellor to the Norman kings. On the death of Rufus he was seized by the Commons under the new king's pleasure should be known about him; and Henry the Scholar, who had good deeds rather than good rights to befriend him in his contest with Robert for the crown, sent the unpopular prelate to the Tower. Henry was not inclined to harshness; and Ralph, though lodged in the keep which he had helped to build, was treated like a guest. He lived in the upper rooms, he had a study, he had a library, he had a dining room; his rooms having plenty of space and light, a good fire-place, a private closet, and free access to St. John's chapel. William de Mandeville, Constable of the Tower, was appointed his keeper, and two shillings a day were paid from the King's exchequer for his diet. He was suffered to have his own servants and chaplains in his rooms, and to send out for such wines and meats as his stomach craved and his purse could buy. One of the richest men in England, he could buy a good deal; one of the cleverest men in England, he could scheme a long way. But before resorting to his money and his wit in self-defence, Ralph tried how far he could reckon on the virtues of his pastoral staff. A bishop was not only a baron of the realm, but a prince of the universal Church. No doubt he had exercised lay functions, acting as a financier, sitting as a judge; but still he was a priest, on whom such laws were laid to be observed. On this point he appealed to Anselm, then Lord Primate, as to his brother and his chief. Anselm, who had just come back from that exile into which he had been driven by Ralph and his master, was in no saintly humor. "Out on this curial!" cried the Lord Primate. "I know him not, neither as brother nor as priest." Anselm took the part of Henry, whom his flock was beginning to call Gaffer Goodricke, and to love with exceeding warmth on account of Goody Mand, the young Saxon princess whom he had taken from a convent to make his wife. Being in this appeal, Ralph took counsel with his wits. The stout Norman knights who kept guard in his chamber were jolly fellows, fond of good cheer, and lusty at a song. On this weakness he began to play. Sending for good wine, and giving orders to his cook, he invited to his table a belt of boisterous knights. When folks looked up at the keep, in which their enemy was caged, they saw lights in the windows rather late, and happily went to bed in the pious hope that their bad bishop was going quickly to his doom. At length his scheme was ripe. Asking the knights to supper he sent out for jars of wine; a potent liquor which, in due time, laid those warriors asleep on bench and stool. The time was winter (the date February 1101), and night came down quickly on the Tower. When the guards were all drunk, the sober bishop arose from his table, drew a long coil of rope from one of the jars, passed into the south room, tied his cord to the window shaft, and taking his crozier with him, let himself down. He was a fat, heavy man; the cord was rather short, and he fell some feet to the ground. But trusty servants who were in waiting picked him up, and hurried him away into a boat, by which he escaped, with his staff and his money, to France. The window from which he escaped is sixty-five feet from the ground."

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon, and clown. As Fuller says, Sir John Oldcastle was the make-up in old plays for a coward. Finding the name current (just as a comic writer finds Pantaloon—a degradation of one of the noblest Italian names—on our modern stage), Shakespeare adopted it in his play. This name Sir John was the creation of those monks and friars against whom the true Sir John had fought his manly fight. Those friars composed our early plays; those friars conducted our early dumb shows; in many of which the first great heretic ever burned in England was a figure. Those friars would naturally gift their assailants with the ugliest vices; for how could an enemy of friars be gallant, young, and pious? In this degraded form the name of Oldcastle was handed down, fair to fair, from inn-yard to inn-yard, until it took immortal shape on Shakespeare's stage. Now comes a personal query, the significance of which will not be overlooked by men who wish to learn what they can of Shakespeare's life. Why, after giving to the Oldcastle tradition that immortal shape, did Shakespeare change the name of his buffoon to Falstaff, and separate himself for ever from the party of abuse? The point is very curious. Some motive of unusual strength must have come into play before such a course could have been taken by the poet. It is not the change of a name, but of a state of mind. For Shakespeare is not content with striking out the name of Oldcastle and writing down that of Falstaff. He does more—much more—something beyond example in his works—He makes a confession of his faith. In his own person, as poet and as man, he proclaims from the stage—Oldcastle died a martyr! That was a sentiment which Raleigh might have held, which Cartwright would have expressed. It was the thought for which Weaver was struggling in his "Poetical Life of Sir John Oldcastle;" for which James, the friend of Jonson, if not of Shakespeare, was compiling his "Defence of the Noble Knight and Martyr, Sir John Oldcastle." The occurrence of such a proclamation suggests that, between the first production of Henry the Fourth and the date of his printed quarto, Shakespeare changed his way of looking at the old heroes of English thought. In the year 1592 a play was printed in London with the title, "The First Part of the True and Honorable History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastle, the Good Lord Cobham." The title-page bore Shakespeare's name. Sir John Oldcastle is now regarded by every one as a play from other pens; in fact, it is known to have been written by three of Shakespeare's fellow-playwrights; but many good critics think the poet may have written some of the lines and edited the work. "This drama was a protest against the wrong which had been done to Oldcastle on the stage by Shakespeare. The prologue said:—

SHAKESPEARE'S CONFESSION.

"What is there in such a man to suggest the idea of Falstaff—a braggart, a coward, a lecher, a thief? Shakespeare was not the first to put this insult on Sir John. When the young poet came to London, he found the play-writers using the name of Oldcastle as a synonym with braggart, buffoon